UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,834	01/30/2004	Patrick Bergeot	Q79501	3848
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 07/14/200 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSY	LVANIA AVENUE, N	CHEEMA, UMAR		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2144	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/14/2008	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/766,834	BERGEOT ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
UMAR CHEEMA	2144		

	UMAR CHEEMA	2144	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 18 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the con	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).  7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [     how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	cowable if submitted in a separate, t  will not be entered, or b)   will	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-25. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a No	ntice of Anneal will not	he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
<ul> <li>11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> <li>12. Note the attached before the Disclosure Statement(s).</li> </ul>		condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	P1 0/58/08) Paper No(s)		
/John Follansbee/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: A. Regarding to claim 1, Applicant argues that Hayball in view of Wilson does not teach or suggest:

- 1. "a multiplicity of equipment elements is each associated with a primary data management protocol".
- 2. "mediation means (MM) coupled to said equipment elements (NE-ij) and to functional interface means (MIF) and system interface means (MIS) coupled to a network management system".
- 3. "protocol adaptation modules (Pa-j) in number at least equal to the number of management protocols associated with said equipment elements".
- 4. "convert primary data, coming from an equipment element (NE-ij) in accordance with a management protocol, into secondary data adapted to said mediation means (MM), and ii) to convert secondary data intended for an equipment element (NE-ij), into primary data in accordance with a management protocol adapted to said equipment element" and feature "mediation means (MM) are arranged, on receipt of the primary or secondary data, to determine the associated equipment element (NE-ij) and then to feed the protocol adaptation modules (Pa-i) corresponding to said determined equipment elements".

As for Point A, it is Examiner's position that Hayball in view of Wilson disclose substantially:

- 1. "a multiplicity of equipment elements is each associated with a primary data management protocol (see Hayball: abstract, col. 4, lines 29-31, 48-65; managing a network having a plurality of distributed components and systems and plurality of application level elements each of which correspond to a function capability of a composite or system, a system being a highest level of composite)".
- 2. "mediation means (MM) coupled to said equipment elements (NE-ij) and to functional interface means (MIF) and system interface means (MIS) coupled to a network management system (see Hayball: abstract, col. 3, lines 54-65; Wilson abstract, par. 0008; mediation management system that sends management operations addressing managed objects on a management interface)".
- 3. "protocol adaptation modules (Pa-j) in number at least equal to the number of management protocols associated with said equipment elements (see Hayball: col. 3, lines 54-65; network management system)".
- 4. "convert primary data, coming from an equipment element (NE-ij) in accordance with a management protocol, into secondary data adapted to said mediation means (MM), and ii) to convert secondary data intended for an equipment element (NE-ij), into primary data in accordance with a management protocol adapted to said equipment element" and feature "mediation means (MM) are arranged, on receipt of the primary or secondary data, to determine the associated equipment element (NE-ij) and then to feed the protocol adaptation modules (Pa-j) corresponding to said determined equipment elements (see Hayball: col. 5, lines 60-67; elements for communication of management data; Wilson: see abstract, par. [0008-0009]; mediation management system that sends management operations addressing managed objects on a management interface)".

Thus it is Examiner's position that Hayball in view of Wilson does teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims as previously cited in final action filed on 03/19/2008 and therefore 35 U.S.C 103(a) rejection with regards to claims 1-25 is proper.